

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-10 were examined and reported in the Office Action. Claims 1-10 are rejected. Claims 1-3, 6-7 and 9-10 are amended. Claims 1-10 remain. Applicant notes that the reference cited in the Office Action on PTO-892 corresponds to the parent priority document FR9806892, which is discussed in Applicant's original specification on page 4 and page 5.

Applicant requests reconsideration of the application in view of the following remarks.

I. **Claim Objections**

A. It is asserted in the Office Action that claim 7 is objected to because it depends from claim 5 but is separated by claim 6, which does not depend from claim 5. Applicant has amended claim 7 to overcome the informal objection.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the Examiner's objection for claim 7 is respectfully requested.

B. It is asserted in the Office Action that claims 7, 9 and 10 are objected to under 37 C.F.R. §1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim should refer to other claims in the alternative only. Applicant has amended claims 7 and 9-10 to overcome the 37 C.F.R. §1.75(c) objections.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the Examiner's objections for claims 7 and 9-10 are respectfully requested.

II. 35 U.S.C. §112

It is asserted in the Office Action that claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicant has amended claim 1 and 6 to conform with 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph. Applicant has amended claims 1 to clarify that the chaos generator produces a non-crypted electric signal and that the device comprising the chaos generator also comprises a feedback loop. Claim 6 has been amended for clarification to overcome the 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph rejection.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph rejections for claims 1-10 are respectfully requested.



RECEIVED

AUG 05 2004

Technology Center 2100

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that all claims now pending, namely 1-10, patentably define the subject invention over the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited at the earliest possible date.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17, particularly extension of time fees.

PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME

Per 37 C.F.R. 1.136(a) and in connection with the Office Action mailed on April 14, 2004, Applicant respectfully petitions the Commissioner for a one (1) month extension of time, extending the period for response to August 14, 2004. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment to Deposit Account No. 02-2666 in the amount of \$110.00 to cover the petition filing fee for a 37 C.F.R. 1.17(a)(2) large entity. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR, & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: July 27, 2004

By:   
Steven Laut, Reg. No. 47,736

12400 Wilshire Boulevard  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, California 90025  
(310) 207-3800

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail with sufficient postage in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendments, Commissioner for Patents, P. O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 on July 27, 2004.

  
Jean Svoboda